

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,387	02/06/2001	Wilson Wai Toy	EIMC-018	4513
75	90 04/01/2005		EXAM	INER
David B. Ritch	nie		ABRAM	s, neil
Thelen Reid & l	******		ADTIBUT	PAPER NUMBER
P. O. Box 64064	40		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
San Jose, CA 95164			2839	
			DATE MAILED: 04/01/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

- •

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
•	09/778,387	TOY ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Neil Abrams	2839
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s)	vn from consideration. owed. rejected.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the l drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec on is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate
Potent and Trademark Office		

Title should be changed to reflect elected invention. Page 3 paragraph on page 15, line 1, seems incorrect, should the insertion be cancelled and replaced by one to – page 15, line 10 ---?

Third drawing sheet objected to it should be labeled "New sheet".

Fig. 7C, addition of portion of VED 702 with pin 718 aligned with slot 715 is suggested to improve disclosure. The numerals 715 could be moved to provide space for such change.

In addition to Replacement Sheets containing the corrected drawing figure(s), applicant is required to submit a marked-up copy of each Replacement Sheet including annotations indicating the changes made to the previous version. The marked-up copy must be clearly labeled as "Annotated Sheets" and must be presented in the amendment or remarks section that explains the change(s) to the drawings. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)(1). Failure to timely submit the proposed drawing and marked-up copy will result in the abandonment of the application.

Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordin alone or taken in view of Bellek.

See last office action, page 3, lines 11-20.

Basically Gordin, fig. 1, discloses an enclosure 11 for a lamp 14, a hinged cover 28 with a top and a sidewall and a feature that apparently forms a hinge that supports the cover in open position. Gordin does not disclose "VED" aspect and the hinge "hold in open position" while appearing to be present explicitly, mentioned.

Application/Control Number: 09/778,387

Art Unit: 2839

Lamps like that at 14 are well known to be vacuum device that use electronics. Therefore obvious to provide lamp 14 as such VED. Also obvious to form Gordin with a hinge like that of Bellek, figs. 6, 7. This type hinge would guide movement of the cover and would hold it in open position, see Bellek, fig. 7.

For claim 16, Gordin at 26, 24 discloses means for power interruption and for claim 17, the Bellek type hinge inherently includes means for preventing galling, etc. Further a lubricant layer would serve such purpose.

Claims 1-5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordin in view of Zerwes.

Gordin, figs. 6, 7 includes a lamp or VED box 11 and covers 128, 129 with tops and sidewalls and hinged to the box 111. The device lacks guide plates with tracks together with cover guide elements. Zerwes figs. 1, 2, 4, 15 discloses guide plates 16 with tracks 24, 24" and a cover 14 having guide elements 46. It would have been obvious to use such a cover system for the Gordin system for 128 or 129. This would enable the cover to be held in open position. Claims 2, 3, 5 met by such cover system., Claims 4, 7, figs: 15 slot 24" has notch 158 and is also read as L-shaped.

Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Arguments on page 15, 16 refers mainly to use of means for aligning as an "L-shape track", however this feature is not recited in any of claims 15-17 and cannot be relied upon toe avoid the rejection. As to claims 1, etc, note that certain prior limitations have been deleted.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: Claims 8-14 all recite features not taught or suggested by prior art of record. For claim 6, Gordin, figs. 6, 7 are applied and to modify the system in view of Zerwer as discussed above and to "also" form it to include power interrupt as in Gordin, fig. 1 at 26, 24 would amount to substantial redesign of the system and would not have been obvious.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Nishimura discloses are lamps to be vacuum electronic devices.

Claims 6 and 8-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number (571)272-2089.

Abrams/ds

03/29/05

EXAMINER ART UNIT 322

lhen